



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/492,137   | 01/27/2000  | Takayuki Watanabe    |                     | 9482             |
| 7590   | 02/23/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.<br>2033 K Street<br>Suite 800<br>Washington, DC 20006 |             |                      |                     | MADSEN, ROBERT A |
|  |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        | 1761             |
| DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005  |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |                           |                  |
|---|---------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Advisory Action<br/>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b> | Application No.           | Applicant(s)     |
|   | 09/492,137                | WATANABE ET AL.  |
|   | Examiner<br>Robert Madsen | Art Unit<br>1761 |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 01 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 8, 9, 13-20 and 22-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See attached Response to Arguments.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## ADVISORY ACTION

1. The Amendment and Response after final have been entered. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Claims 1-4.,6,8,10,13 remain pending. Claim 13 was withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a non-elected species.
2. Per the Interview of January 12 2004, the Examiner has re-considered the Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed June 7, 2004. The Declaration compares Applicant's inventive composition (i.e. Example 1) with the composition taught by the individual references that were relied on in rejections made under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) based on a combination of references. Applicant maintains that unexpected increased shelf stability is attainable with the recited combination of water-soluble hemicellulose and trehalose, which is a combination not taught by a *single* reference.
3. The Examiner maintains that the Declaration is insufficient to overcome the rejection of Claims 1-4,6,8,10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shisheido (JP06040845 A) in view of Hattori (JP 06157238A) and Claims 1,6,8, 10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto et al. (JP 10056969 A) in view of Morimoto et al. (JP 10066516) as set forth in the Office Action mailed March 5,2004. The evidence presented is not germane to the rejection at issue and is not relevant to the issue of nonobviousness of the claimed subject matter and provides no objective evidence thereof.
4. The rejection at issue involves claims drawn to a powder composition with 25-85% trehalose and 5-60% hemicellulose. The Examiner has established a *prima facie*

case of obviousness for combining references to arrive at the recited powder composition (note the rejections made in the Office Action mailed March 5, 2004 and the arguments made in the Office Action mailed January 30, 2004). The Declaration shows a powder comprising 16% trehalose and 16% hemicellulose, and compares its stability to the stability of compositions of the individual references. A powder having 16% trehalose and 16% hemicellulose having a particular stability is not the claimed subject matter. The claimed subject matter is to a powder composition with 25-85% trehalose and 5-60% hemicellulose and the rejection at issue is the combination of references to arrive at a powder composition with 25-85% trehalose and 5-60% hemicellulose. An affidavit or declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 must compare the *claimed* subject matter as stated in both 716.02 (e) and 716.02 (d).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Madsen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1402. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-3:30PM M-F.

6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert Madsen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1761

RAM

  
MILTON I. CANO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700